UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,322	03/26/2001	Barry Lynn Royer	2001P04776 US	8854

7590	03/26/2004

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application N .		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/817,322		ROYER ET AL.
		Examiner		Art Unit
		VAN H NGUYEN		2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 March 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)   **Office Acti n Summary**   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 4

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-23 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Feldman**

(U.S. 6,154,741) in view of **Asghar et al.** (U.S. 6,230,255).

4.   As to claim 1, Feldman teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system

for use in a first application concurrently operating together with a plurality of network

compatible applications *(fig. 1 and associated text)*, comprising:

       - an entitlement processor for enabling user access to the first application in response to

validation of user identification information *(col.2, line 47- col.3, line 16 and fig.10)*.

       Feldman does not explicitly teach a communication processor for intermittently

communicating an activity indication to a managing application within a timeout window, the

activity indication being communicated sufficiently often to prevent an inactivity timeout of the

first application.

Asghar teaches a communication processor for intermittently communicating an activity

indication to a managing application within a timeout window, the activity indication being

communicated sufficiently often to prevent an inactivity timeout of the first application (*col. 10,*

lines 38-50 and fig.1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Feldman and Asghar because Asghar's teaching

would have provided the capability for monitoring the applications running in the access control

system.

5.   As to claim 2, Feldman teaches the activity indication notifies the managing application

of activity by the first application and includes *one or more of,* (a) a session identifier for

identifying a particular user initiated session, (b) a URL to be contacted if the activity

notification is not successful, (c) an identification of a type of event preventing the activity

notification from being successful *(col.13, lines 1-29).*

6.   As to claim 3, Feldman teaches the communication processor stores a plurality of activity

indications and sends the plurality of activity indications as a batch to the managing

application *(col.2, line 64-col.3, line 16).*

7.   As to claim 4, Feldman teaches the plurality of activity indications comprise at least two

PC function activity indications representing, (a) keyboard activity, (b) mouse activity, (c) other

data entry device activity, (d) PC application operation activity indication *(fig. 10).*

8.   As to claim 5, Feldman teaches the first application and the managing application reside

in the same PC *(fig. 11A).*

9.   As to claim 6, Feldman teaches the communication processor intermittently communicates activity indications to the managing application using a plurality of different commands including an activity notification command and a command involving at least one of, (a) determining a user operation session identifier from the managing application and (b) sending a URL to the managing application *(col.13, lines 1-29)*.

10.   As to claim 7, Feldman does not explicitly teach the communication processor communicates to the managing application a request to receive an activity indication associated with the first application and maintained by the managing application, the activity indication indicating time since the last activity update.

Asghar teaches the communication processor communicates to the managing application a request to receive an activity indication associated with the first application and maintained by the managing application, the activity indication indicating time since the last activity update *(col. 10, lines 38-50 and fig.1)*.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Feldman and Asghar because Asghar's teaching would have provided the capability for monitoring the applications running in the access control system.

11.   As to claim 8, Feldman teaches a browser application providing a user interface display permitting user entry of identification information for validation by the validation processor *(fig. 11)*.

12.   As to claim 9, Feldman does not explicitly teach the communication processor

communicates a time-out threshold value comprising the timeout window to the managing

application.

        Asghar teaches the communication processor communicates a time-out threshold value

comprising the timeout window to the managing application (*col. 10, lines 38-50 and fig. 1*).

        It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Feldman and Asghar because Asghar's teaching

would have provided the capability for monitoring the applications running in the access control

system.

13.   As to claim 10, the rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Claim 10,

however, further recites an input processor for intermittently receiving activity indications from

a plurality of concurrently operating applications; an activity monitor for updating individual

activity status indicators.

        Feldman teaches an input processor for intermittently receiving activity indications from

a plurality of concurrently operating applications (*fig. 1 and associated text*); an activity monitor

for updating individual activity status indicators (*fig. 6 and associated text*).

14.   As to claim 11, Feldman does not explicitly teach the input processor receives and stores

a time-out threshold value for individual applications of the plurality of concurrently operating

applications.

        Asghar teaches the input processor receives and stores a time-out threshold value for

individual applications of the plurality of concurrently operating applications (*fig. 1 and

associated text*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Feldman and Asghar because Asghar's teaching

would have provided the capability for monitoring the applications running in the access control

system.

15.   As to claim 12, Feldman does not explicitly teach an activity status indicator comprises a

time indication identifying when activity of a particular application was last reported, and the

time-out threshold comprises a predetermined time duration and the managing application

determines the particular application to be inactive if the time indication exceeds the time-out

threshold.

Asghar teaches an activity status indicator comprises a time indication identifying when

activity of a particular application was last reported, and the time-out threshold comprises a

predetermined time duration and the managing application determines the particular application

to be inactive if the time indication exceeds the time-out threshold *(figs.19A-19B)*.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Feldman and Asghar because Asghar's teaching

would have provided the capability for monitoring the applications running in the access control

system.

16.   As to claim 13, Feldman teaches the input processor receives activity indications from a

plurality of different commands including an activity notification command and a command

involving at least one of, (a) determining a user operation session identifier from the

managing application and (b) sending a URL to the managing application *(col.13, lines 1-29)*.

17.   As to claim 14, Feldman does not explicitly teach the communication processor

communicates notice of the application time-out event to applications of the plurality of

concurrently operating applications that have previously requested a notification of session

termination.

        Asghar teaches the communication processor communicates notice of the application

time-out event to applications of the plurality of concurrently operating applications that have

previously requested a notification of session termination *(col.11, lines 38-50)*.

        It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Feldman and Asghar because Asghar's teaching '

would have provided the capability for monitoring the applications running in the access control

system.

18.   As to claim 15, Feldman teaches the communication processor communicates notice of

the application time-out event in response to at least: one condition of, (a) a received command

requesting notification and (b) a received communication from an application session

having previously produced a time-out event and (c) automatically upon generation of

the time-out event *(col.12, lines 17-52)*.

19.   As to claim 16, Feldman teaches activity indication includes one or more of, (a) an

identification of particular user initiated session, (b) a URL to be contacted if the activity

notification is not successful, (c) an identification of a type of event preventing the activity

notification from being successful *(col.13, lines 1-29)*.

20.   As to claim 17, Feldman does not explicitly teach a common timeout period for the

plurality of concurrently operating applications.

Asghar teaches a common timeout period for the plurality of concurrently operating applications *(col.11, lines 38-50)*.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Feldman and Asghar because Asghar's teaching would have provided the capability for monitoring the applications running in the access control system.

21.   As to claim 18, Feldman does not explicitly teach a predetermined default value for the time-out threshold values.

Asghar teaches a predetermined default value for the time-out threshold values.

(col.11, lines 38-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Feldman and Asghar because Asghar's teaching would have provided the capability for monitoring the applications running in the access control system.

22.   As to claim 19, the rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Claim 10, however, further recites a browser application providing a user interface display permitting user entry of identification information and commands for a plurality of Internet compatible applications.

Feldman teaches a browser application providing a user interface display permitting user entry of identification information and commands for a plurality of Internet compatible applications *(col.13, lines 1-29 and fig. 1)*.

23.   As to claim 20, Feldman teaches the activity indication notification includes one or more

of, (a) an identification of a particular user initiated session, (b) a URL to be contacted if the

activity notification is not successful, (c) an identification of a type of event preventing the

activity notification from being successful *(col.13, lines 1-29)*.

24.   As to claim 21, Feldman does not explicitly teach a common timeout period is used as the

inactivity timeout for the plurality of concurrently operating applications.

       Asghar teaches a common timeout period is used as the inactivity timeout for the

plurality of concurrently operating applications *(col.11, lines 38-50)*.

       It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Feldman and Asghar because Asghar's teaching

would have provided the capability for monitoring the applications running in the access control

system.

25.   As to claim 22, it is directed to a method for presenting the system of claim 10, and is

similarly rejected under the same rationale.

26.   As to claim 23, it is directed to a method for presenting the system of claim 1, and is

similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

27.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

- Zamanzadeh et al. (U.S.6535917) teaches "Market data domain and enterprise system implemented by a master entitlement processor ."

- Uyesugi et al. (U.S.5949777) teaches "Wireless communication processor system."

- Kaul et al. (U.S. 4363094) teaches "Communications processor."

28.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VHN

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100